

William R. Mulready; (Bill is fine)
P.O. BOX 519
Bethlehem, CT. 06751
203-278-9811
bmulready7@yahoo.com

January 28, 2013

I request copy of each and all submissions to your NOTICE seeking comments and suggestions to continue compliance as mandated under Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA or Title II), and including all contact information please. Please include those you reject or fail to consider.

OPEN letter and comments to;

MR. Patrick L. Carroll III, Chair and full Committee Members of Public Service and Trust Commission: Advisory Board on the Americans with Disabilities Act and ALL other interested parties or addressees'. ada.program@jud.ct.gov

RE: Board NOTICE and "seeking" and "welcome"; for "suggestions on how the Judicial Branch can continue its compliance with the law as mandated under Title II of the Act." And;

"Suggestions or comments relating to specific litigation or cases will not be considered."

Dear MR. Carroll III; Atty. Mark Ciarciello; Ms. Sandra Lugo-Gines; and full committee:

While I and others may, can and will commend your current efforts in part; I for one wish to inform you that as of the date I write here in reply seeking and suggesting compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (here after ADA, Act, Title I, Title II, Title III, Title IV, or Title V); you are 21 (twenty one) years and 2 (two) days late. Full compliance with Title II of the ADA was mandated for January 26, 1992. While that is the mandated date of compliance, I believe it can be successfully argued that Public entities such as The Ct. Judicial Branch would be subjected to the non-discriminating mandates of Title II of the ADA as far back as July 26, 1990, the day President Bush signed into law the Act. I do not abandon that argument and defer such to either others and or another day. For purpose of this letter, I focus on January 26, 1992.

In full respect Judge and Committee; by the LAW you reference in your NOTICE, (Title II, its implementing regulations and guidance of its Technical Assistance Manual), you are Specifically prohibited from excluding any individual from participation in or denying the benefits of the services, programs, or activities of this public entity welcome and seeking of compliance with Title II.

Congress enacted the ADA in 1990 *"to provide a clear and comprehensive National mandate for the elimination of discrimination against individuals with disabilities."* 42 U.S.C. Sec. 12101(b)(1). Congress found that *"historically, society has tended to isolate and segregate individuals with disabilities, and, despite some improvements, such forms of discrimination against individuals with disabilities continue to be a serious and pervasive social problem."* 42 U.S.C. Sec. 12101 (a)(2). For those and other reasons Congress found, Congress prohibited discrimination against individuals with disabilities by public entities.

[N]o qualified individual with a disability shall, by reason of such disability, be excluded from participation in or be denied the benefits of the services, programs, or activities of a public entity, or be subjected to discrimination by any such entity. 42 U.S.C. Sec. 12132.

As directed by Congress, 42 U.S.C. Sec. 12134, the Attorney General issued regulations implementing Title II, which are based on regulations issued under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act. See 42 U.S.C. Sec 12134; 28 C.F.R. Sec. 35.190(a); Executive Order 12250, 45 Fed. Reg. 72995 (1980), reprinted in 42 U.S.C. Sec 2000d-1. (Section 504 prohibits entities that receive Federal Funds from discriminating against individuals with disabilities. 29 U.S.C. Sec. 794.)

Title II provides in part and not limiting; the Regulations and Technical Assistance Part 35 Nondiscrimination on the basis of Disability in State and Local Government Services (as amended by the final rule published on September 15, 2010) Authority: 5 U.S.C. 301; 28 U.S.C. 509, 510; 42 U.S.C. 12134. Subpart A ---General Sec. 35.101 Purpose.

The purpose of this part is to effectuate subtitle A of Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12131, which prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability by public entities.

Sec. 35.102 Application.

- (a) Except as provided in paragraph (b) of this section, this part applies to all services, programs, and activities provided or made available by public entities.*

Sec. 35.130 General prohibition against discrimination.

- (a) No qualified individual with a disability shall, on the basis of disability, be excluded from participation in or be denied the benefits of the services, programs, or activities of a public entity, or be subjected to discrimination by any public entity.*

(ii) That have the purpose or effect of defeating or substantially impairing accomplishment of the objectives of the public entity's program with respect to individuals with disabilities; or

(iii) That perpetuates the discrimination of another public entity if both public entities are subjective to common administrative control or are agencies of the same State.

(7) A public entity shall make reasonable modifications in policies, practices, or procedures when the modifications are necessary to avoid discrimination on the basis of disability, unless the public entity can demonstrate that making the modifications would fundamentally alter the nature of the service, program, or activity.

(8) A public entity shall not impose or apply eligibility criteria that screen out or tend to screen out an individual with a disability or any class of individuals with disabilities from fully and equally enjoying any service, program, or activity, unless such criteria can be shown to be necessary for the provision of the service, program, or activity being offered.

(d) A public entity shall administer services, programs, and activities in the most integrated setting appropriate to the needs of qualified individuals with disabilities.

The preamble to the 35.130(d) regulation provides in part;

*Paragraph (d) and (e), ***,provide that the public entity must administer services, programs, and activities in the most integrated setting appropriate to the needs of qualified individuals with disabilities, i.e., in a setting that enables individuals with disabilities to interact with nondisabled persons to the fullest extent possible, and that persons with disabilities must be provided the option of declining to accept a particular accommodation.*

The Americans with Disabilities Act Title II Technical Assistance Manual Covering State and Local Government Programs and Services II-8.0000 ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS, Regulatory references: 28 CFR 35.105-35.150© and (d).

(2) A public entity must review its policies and programs and practices to determine whether any exclude or limit the participation of individuals with disabilities in its programs, activities, or services. Such policies or practice must be modified, unless they are necessary for the operation or provision of the program, service, or activity. The self-evaluation should identify policy modifications to be implemented and include complete justifications for any exclusionary or limiting policies or practices that will not be modified.

*(3) A Public entity should review its policies to ensure that it communicates with applicants, participants, and members of the public with disabilities in a manner that is as effective as its communications with others. ****

*If a public entity identifies policies and practices that deny or limit the participation of individuals with disabilities in its programs, activities, and services, when should it make changes? Once a public entity has identified policies and practices that deny or limit the participation of individuals with disabilities in its programs, activities, and services, it should take immediate remedial action to eliminate the impediments to full and equivalent participation. ****

A

If a government official in official capacity refuse to follow the law, we become a lawless society. The rule of law applies to all equally.

Judge, and Committee members; you may want to review in the U.S. Supreme Court No. (May 17, 2004) No. 02-1667; Tennessee v. George Lane *et al.*

This is the LAW.

TENNESSEE v. LANE *et al.* certiorari to the united states court of appeals for the sixth circuit No. 02-1667. Argued January 13, 2004--Decided May 17, 2004

This duty to accommodate is perfectly consistent with the well-established due process principle that, "within the limits of practicability, a State must afford to all individuals a meaningful opportunity to be heard" in its courts. Boddie, 401 U. S., at 379 (internal quotation marks and citation omitted).²⁰ Our cases have recognized a number of affirmative obligations that flow from this principle: the duty to waive filing fees in certain family-law and criminal cases,²¹ the duty to provide transcripts to criminal defendants seeking review of their convictions,²² and the duty to provide counsel to certain criminal defendants.²³ Each of these cases makes clear that ordinary considerations of cost and convenience alone cannot justify a State's failure to provide individuals with a meaningful right of access to the courts. Judged against this backdrop, Title II's affirmative obligation to accommodate persons with disabilities in the administration of justice cannot be said to be "so out of proportion to a supposed remedial or preventive object that it cannot be

understood as responsive to, or designed to prevent, unconstitutional behavior." Boerne, 521 U. S., at 532; Kimel, 528 U. S., at 86.²⁴ *It is, rather, a reasonable prophylactic measure, reasonably targeted to a legitimate end.*

For these reasons, we conclude that Title II, as it applies to the class of cases implicating the fundamental right of access to the courts, constitutes a valid exercise of Congress' §5 authority to enforce the guarantees of the Fourteenth Amendment. The judgment of the Court of Appeals is therefore affirmed.

It is so ordered.

File Name: 03a0010a.06, **UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS, FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT;**
George Lane; Beverly Jones, v. State of Tennessee, No. 98-6730

Based on the record before Congress in considering the Americans with Disabilities legislation, it was reasonable for Congress to conclude that it needed to enact legislation to prevent states from unduly burdening constitutional rights, including the right of access to the courts. States have myriad ways to unburden these rights, from the major step of renovating facilities to the relatively minor step of assigning aides to assist in access to the facilities. The record demonstrated that public entities' failure to accommodate the needs of qualified persons with disabilities may result directly from unconstitutional animus and impermissible stereotypes. Title II ensures that the refusal to accommodate an individual with a disability is genuinely based on unreasonable cost or actual inability to accommodate, not on inconvenience or unfounded concerns about costs.

This statutory protection is a preventive measure commensurate to the gravity of precluding access to the courts by those with disabilities. In addition, these requirements are carefully tailored to the unique features of disability discrimination that persists in public services. A simple ban on discrimination against those with disabilities lacks teeth. The continuing legacy of discrimination is too powerful. Title II affirmatively promotes integration of those with disabilities.

B

Mr. Patrick L. Carroll III, Chair and all Committee Members; as I show above, administratively you are all individually and as a Committee with Charge of the Committee to full compliance of Title II of the ADA. You individually and as Committee prohibited from excluding from full participation and prohibited from denying the full benefits of the programs, activities and services of this Committee; and that includes the acceptance and equal and the same acceptance, processing, recording, consideration, and reach of full remedial application of past disability discrimination, elimination of current disability discrimination, and prohibition of future disabilities discrimination. This includes full equal and the same consideration of suggestions or comments relating to specific litigation or cases. In addition;

Judge Patrick L. Carroll III, Chair and separately your with primary responsibilities' to the administrative duties of the Judicial Branch; and each and every Committee Member; you are each in position and responsible, obligated, with authority, and accountable to remedy disability discrimination immediately, eliminate current disability discrimination immediately, and prohibit future disability discrimination immediately. Committee members, as State Actors or State

Contractors or State Volunteers, you are prohibited from any and all disability discrimination at all times. However it could be argued I believe that you are not on 24 hours/7days a week obligation to remedy past, eliminate current, and prohibit future disability discrimination within the CT Judicial Branch. Judge Patrick L. Carroll III, Chair, your obligated at all times to afford every individual the full Rights and Protection of the United States Constitution including the Fourteenth Amendment, and the ADA. You are by Title of Judge and expectation to address yourself or others to address you as Honorable with the responsibility obligation authority and accountability 24 hours/7 days each week to remedy past disability discrimination, eliminate current disability discrimination, and prohibit future disability discrimination. Anything less by any of this Committee is a fraud and perjury to the Judicial Branch and We The People of Connecticut and indeed the World.

C

It is not just relevant, it is not an option; it is the LAW. You Mr. Patrick L. Carroll III, Chair and the Board/Committee; are legally under the command of the ADA and to include at all times full implementation of Title II; No Disability Discrimination at all. ZERO Tolerance.

Mr. Patrick L. Carroll III, Chair; acceptance of Title Judge and to put, say, or expect the word Honorable to be associated the full respect; you accepted the responsibility, obligations, authority, and accountability to provide and afford to each and all individuals the commands of the LAWS of Connecticut, the Connecticut Constitution, the LAWS of the United States, the Rights and Protections of the United States Constitution, including the Fundamental implied and prophylactic Rights and Protections of the 1st, 4th, 5th, 6th, 8th, 9th, 10th, and 14th Amendments, the ADA, the ADAA of 2008, Sec 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, the Civil Rights Act and all the disability LAWS. This includes the Settlement Agreement between the USDOJ and the State of CT Judicial Branch Nov. 2003, and the State of Connecticut's stated position to support every effort to eradicate the effects of the documented long-term, pervasive and invidious discrimination against people with disabilities in the provision of public services; 24 hours/7days a week with affirmative meaningful efforts not exclusion, not denial, not theatrical efforts. You or any Judge, are not allowed to pick and chose to exclude, deny, discriminate any disabled individual at any time.

It is relevant. The CT Judicial Branch was legally obligated to provide the full protections and Rights above, of the ADA on April 19, 1995 and did not. It is relevant that same as today forward, the CT Judicial Branch is legally obligated to provide all individuals, including me William R. Mulready Docket No. X1 and Docket No. X2 and Docket No. unknown, the full protection and Rights of the ADA as of January 26, 1992, through April 19, 1995, through today January 28, 2013 and going forward. The CT Judicial Branch failed then and fails today.

I do not know the majority of the ADA Advisory Board Committee Members. Mr. Atty. Mark Ciarciello I am aware has presented himself as the State of Connecticut Judicial Branch ADA Coordinator; without providing any definition of this title, without describing the difference of an ADA Coordinator and what Title II Regulations proscribe in 28 CFR PART 35.107(a) Designated Responsible Employee for Compliance of Title II of the ADA by the CT Judicial Branch. Mr. Atty. Mark Ciarciello is not providing meaningful notification or meaningful communications to his contact information to individuals looking for the CT Judicial Branch Designated Responsible Employee for ADA Title II compliance. Mr. Atty. Mark Ciarciello is not

providing his written Job Description, date of hire, date of becoming the CT Judicial Branch ADA Coordinator, who he was appointed by, who he reports to, or what if any authority he has.

Ms. Sandra Lugo-Gines; presents herself and is presented to individuals around the State of Connecticut seeking Rights and Protections of the ADA from the CT Judicial Branch; as the ADA Coordinator or ADA Facilitator; yet when pressed for Rights and Protections or to process complaints, Ms. Sandra Lugo-Gines passes the buck and defers to others. That's frustrating and in conflict with all above.

Ms. Sandra Lugo-Gines and I have shared some limited contact on the subject matter and as such we know each other in limited recognition. I personally like Ms. Sandra Lugo-Gines and personally believe Ms. Sandra Lugo-Gines to be a very capable person to the position given; however Ms. Sandra Lugo-Gines has been given zero authority. I suspect the same from Mr. Mark Ciarciello. However; both Atty. Mark Ciarciello and Ms Sandra Lugo-Gines have absolute authority and responsibility obligation and accountability to 28 CFR PART 35.107(a); to provide affirmative action's in providing the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth in every ADA request, application and complaint. In that they fail, in their silence and in their deed, they present fraud and prudery.

I know not Mr. Atty Mark Ciarciello, of the below. Ms Sandra Lugo-Gines has been given training, time, contact to persons and materials to educate herself—train the trainer insight and understanding to the ADA in full. Expert, I do not burden Ms. Sandra Lugo-Gines that expectation, unless she wishes to declare such. I don't look or expect to find an ADA expert. I expect to find independent competence, and affirmative action's to the promotion of remedy of past disability discrimination, elimination of current disability discrimination, and prohibition of future disability discrimination. Independent authority to correct or to implement modifications, and to freely speak out in behaves of the individual disabled in each and every case. To address in every instance non compliance of the ADA by any State Actor or State Contractor or State Volunteer in litigations and cases and in administrative.

My opinion and strong belief is that Ms. Sandra Lugo-Gines has been given instructions by intent or effect—to be and direct barriers to individuals seeking rights, protections, accommodations, and or modifications from the CT Judicial Branch for ADA obligations.

Ms. Sandra Lugo-Gines is in position and has accepted her life's work to date, and pay from We The People; Of The People; By The People; For The People. Not for the good of protection of the CT Judicial Branch or individuals within who have failed before or continue; or that seek to cover up past and present failures to ADA compliance. Ms. Sandra Lugo-Gines knows the words I speak and here in write to be true.

Ms Sandra Lugo-Gines acceptance of position, training and in lesser capacity pay is by ADA Definition and the LAWS of Connecticut, the State Of Connecticut Constitution; the LAWS of the United States; The United States Constitution; the ADA, the ADAA of 2008; Section 504 of The Rehabilitation Act of 1973; the Civil Rights Acts and all disability acts; the 1st, 4th, 5th 6th 8th,

9th, 10th and 14th Amendments; a mandated reporter with such reports not behind closed doors but on all records, and at every request. Ms. Sandra Lugo-Gines is not sworn to silence in whole or in part. Ms Sandra Lugo-Gines is sworn to shout; expose; and full implementation of compliance of the ADA by the State of Connecticut Judicial Branch at all times. This includes the full elimination of each and every barrier; cover-up; discrimination; discriminatory action; corrective action to complaints brought to her attention.

As does Mr. Atty. Mark Ciarcello; as does this advisory Board and each individual member of the Board. Anything less is illegal; is a fraud; is a perjury at and on each individual instance. Each of these illegal, fraudulent, perjury actions perpetuates significant cumulative collateral consequences in direct opposition to the provisions and mandates of the ADA, Congress, President and U.S. Supreme Court.

My words above are not intended to point blame on Ms. Sandra Lugo-Gines, who is not to be blamed. What an injustice that would be. Mr. Patrick L. Carroll III, Chair, administrative and or judicial Judge; you and those above and beside you are to be blamed, and you know this to be true as well. Cover-up, just like your Notice. Ms. Sandra Lugo-Gines and Mr. Atty. Mark Ciarcello; and this Board are at fault if any refuses to address and speak up on the public record. Walk the closed door talk with an open door. Declare the Truth, The Whole Truth and nothing but The Truth including the shout of that that remains silent to date.

D

You refuse to consider suggestions or comments relating to specific litigation or cases. Our Appellate Court and CT Supreme Court enforces prohibited opinions and rulings. As shown in Tenn. V. Lane, the Full Judicial Branch has the responsibility obligation authority and accountability to provide affirmative inclusion, that's the law. Ct. Court and your rulings are outlawed like the Ugly Laws and Buck v. Bell days.

Mr. Chair, Board, Committee members. I recognize the probability that there MAY BE a minority handful of litigation or cases who's merits of such litigation or case are or could be directly related to or the subject matter to be decided is disability discrimination and as such the litigation of such case MAY NOT BE proper to the ears, eyes and voice of this Board. I put that at less than one half of a percentage of litigation or cases. However with the State of Connecticut Judicial Branch in non compliance with the ADA, even those litigations and or cases have the high suspect of probability of disability discrimination and as such the Judicial Branch has no jurisdiction to decide and or enforce its judgments.

The Merits or Standing of the remaining 99-1/2 percentage of litigants and cases are not the subject matter or jurisdiction of this Board or individual members, I can agree understand and proclaim. Family Matters for instance, or Motor Vehicle Matters, or Criminal Matters, or Property Matters, or Juvenile Matters or any of the legal matters proscribed by the CT Legislators and Governor, are not the subject matter or jurisdiction of this Board and I shout in agreement. But the Merits, Standing and Judgments of all Litigation and Cases are to be free of Disability Discrimination, and the Merits, or Standing and Jurisdiction of every Disability Discrimination complaint, request for accommodation and or modification is the separate and isolated responsibility, obligation, authority and accountability of each member of this Board. The

commands and Mandates of Title II and the Fourteenth Amendment prohibits the decision or opinion or the litigation to start without the compliance, application and enforcement of Title II and the Fourteenth Amendment. You each have the responsibility, obligation, authority and accountability to remedy past disability discrimination, eliminate current disability discrimination, and prohibit future disability discrimination. If that means overturning cases decided from disability discrimination, that's the ADA merits, not the Case merits.

The CT Judicial Branch of We The People of Connecticut and indeed all the people of the World; The Connecticut Courts of We The People of Connecticut and indeed of all the people of the World; and each and every person employed, contractor, or volunteered to the Connecticut Judicial Branch of We The People and indeed all the people of the World are with, hold, responsible, obligated, authorized, and accountable to ZERO TOLERANCE ZERO DISABILITY DISCRIMINATION and the full implementation of the ADA of 1990 and the compliance since January 26, 1992; ADAA of 2008; Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973; all Civil Rights and Disability Acts and Laws. This responsibility, obligation, authority and accountability extend to April 19, 1995 and through each and every day since and beyond today.

Mr. Patrick L. Carroll III, Chair; Board; you proclaim your seeking specific suggestions on how the Judicial Branch can continue its compliance with the law as mandated under Title II of the Act. You cannot continue compliance until you begin compliance. You cannot begin compliance without remedy in full equity and in Law to past Disability Discrimination; Elimination of current Disability Discrimination; and prohibit future Disability Discrimination.

Your Notice to which I address within is additional proof of the Judicial Branch non compliance with the ADA. Non compliance today means non compliance on April 15, 1995. I have proved that here and in the past. I have identified and proved the chosen 31 lies of Walter M. Pickett, JR. Trial Judge Referee, a man who also called himself Honorable, with the question raised by citizens of Judge Pickett's home community of Judge Pickett's sobriety, (did Judge 31 lies Pickett OUI Opinion under the influence? Or DUI decision under the Influence TUI Trial under the influence? If so that removes him under Article III of the U.S. Constitution, in good behavior); to be just that 31 lies, to gender and disability discrimination. In addition The Plaintiff has since admitted to false bringing false allegations against me based on fears in her head based on nothing that she reacts to. Hidden Disabilities.

Mr. Patrick L. Carroll III, Chair; Mr. Atty. Mark Ciarcello; Ms. Sandra Lugo-Gines; Board and or Committee:

Compliance??

You want compliance, compliance starts with a NON DISCRIMINATION POLICY WITH FULL APPLICATION TO January 26, 1992. Compliance starts when the CT Judicial Branch stops discriminating. Compliance starts with the Fundamental Right to remedy is provided as outlined in Title II outside the Court if so chosen, because it is faster, less costly, and a completely separate matter than merits of cases; except that the Judicial Branch has Affirmative responsibility obligation authority accountability to unit litigants not interfere when it is recognized that disability may be a cause of action being brought to Court.

You want compliance??? Compliance starts with the State of Connecticut Judicial Branch "identifies" disability. I have no burden to identify disability, I'm not applying for a job at the Branch or employed by the Branch. If so, it is than my responsibility obligation authority and accountability to make a disability know and request "accommodations" and the Branch has the right to refuse and deny based on unreasonable to the needs of the Branch. For citizens entering the Judicial Branch in any capacity, the Branch must identify and offer "Reasonable Modifications" that the citizen has the right to refuse. Big difference and this Judicial Branch does not have it right and continues to discriminate every day every part of the Branch. Ain't that right Ms. Sandra Lugo-Gines??? I can't hear you??? Mr. Atty. Mark Ciarciello??? Board??? Judge???

E

I want my babies back today; I want my property back today; I want my right to vote for the people and issues I wish to vote for back today; I want my right to pursuit of happiness back today; I want my great name back today; and I want my respect for that Black Robe back today. That's your first step to compliance with the LAW as mandated under Title II of the Act.

Mr. Patrick L. Carroll III, Chair, JUDGE; as you discriminate you dishonor and disrespect your name, you disrespect your profession, you disrespect your job, you disrespect that Black Robe and all your brethren and sisteren that don it, you disrespect the Judicial Branch of We The People, and You Disrespect We The People. To date JUDGE, your personal legacy ain't good. Shame on you.

Mr. Patrick L. Carroll III, Chair; Mr. Atty. Mark Ciarciello; Ms. Sandra Lugo-Gines; Board and or Committee: Mr. Patrick L. Carroll III, Chair; Mr. Atty. Mark Ciarciello; Ms. Sandra Lugo-Gines; Board and or Committee: I'm not aware of when you first posted this NOTICE? Important because you need to make a "Reasonable Modification" to your NOTICE and post a new equal and the same NOTICE for an equal amount of time and perhaps an additional 20% to accommodate the disabled you have to date excluded and denied. And additionally you are required to delay your report so to include the suggestions and considerations of the rest of WE THE PEOPLE you neglect, exclude, and deny.

Others I suspect will choose to follow;

Yours For Barrier Free Courts With Sober And Honest Judges

William R. Mulready. (Bill)